

WORKERS OF THE WORLD UNITE.

THE

INTERNATIONAL SOCIALIST

No. 111. Official Organ of the Australasian Socialist Party.

SATURDAY, MARCH 16th, 1918.

Registered at the General Post Office, Sydney, for transmission by post as a Newspaper.

Price: One Penny

The Russian Revolution.

A Review and a Retrospect.

Compiled by J. A. D., W. H., J. B. S.

CONTINUED FROM PAGE 108.

Our first explanation of the difference in the attitude of the Socialists and the Social Democrats, and the difference in their action, lies in the fact that the Socialists are a revolutionary party, and the Social Democrats are a reformist party. The Socialists are a party of the future, and the Social Democrats are a party of the present. The Socialists are a party of the future, and the Social Democrats are a party of the present. The Socialists are a party of the future, and the Social Democrats are a party of the present.

The workers in the factories were organized in the factories into industrial unions. As the work of the revolutionists had to be done underground, the workers could not organize openly with the object of accomplishing the social revolution, but they organized ostensibly for the purpose of combatting the employers in the shop. But, although merely craft unions on the surface, these unions were inseparable from the Socialist movement and established on a class-conscious revolutionary basis. The unions became the nucleus of organizing the ranks of the revolutionists; workers in the shops were put in touch with the literature and activities of the movement. Men, selected for their intelligence and trustworthiness, were taken into the underground and taught working class principles, with the result that the underground grew strong in numbers, having over one million members, and the unions more conscious of the conditions that would govern their emancipation, and they developed their solidarity and organization accordingly.

After the Government of Russia was founded in 1917, the first thing that the Government did was to abolish the Socialists. The Socialists had developed in the factories and in some secret places there were as many as 6000 to 8000 workers in a single factory, and the cotton spinning mills alone had over half a million workers. One factory at Krasnodar employed over 10,000 workers, and the Petrograd coal mines were greater than those in Alsace-Lorraine. It is the largest in Europe. Russia has some highly industrialized cities, the principal ones being Odessa, Ekaterinburg, Moscow, Lódz, Warsaw and many others, where not only were the more skilled workers in industrial unions, but also clerks, sweepers, porters, laborers, and other workers who are not organized in such capitalistically developed countries like England and America.

That the revolutionary Socialists understood the position is clearly seen by the following statement by N. Lenin issued in March, 1917:—

"As to the revolutionary organization and its task, the conquest of the power of the State and militarism. From the perils of the French Commune of 1871 Marx shows that the working class cannot simply take over the governmental machinery for its own purposes. The proletariat must break down this machinery. And this has either been concealed or denied by the political opportunists. But it is the most valuable lesson of the Paris Commune of 1871 and the revolution in Russia of 1905.

"The difference between us and the anarchists is that we admit the State is a necessity in the development of our revolution. The difference between the Bolsheviks and the political opportunists of the Kautsky school is, that we claim that

we do not need the bourgeois state machinery as completed in the 'democratic' bourgeois republics (France and U.S.A.), but the direct power of armed and organized workers. Such is the state we need. Such was the character of the Commune of 1871 and of the Council of Workmen and Soldiers of 1905. On this basis we build."

Now a word or two about other organizations. The Zemstvos are rural, provincial organizations, created in 1864 by Alexander II, who liberated the serfs. These are controlled by the nobility, who form the large land-proprietary class of the provinces; the noblemen, who own the land and representatives of the peasantry, have a say in electing the council. A conference in 1915 saw the formation of the All-Russian union of Zemstvos, who helped out the inefficient military authorities in organizing hospitals and hospital trains, and extended its operations right into the war front, in victualling, sanitary and medical work. The first year the union provided 300,000 pairs of boots and 1,700,000 pairs of shoes bought in U.S.A. collected 550,000 skins and hides in six months, and arranged through private factories for tanning and manufacturing various outfits from the prepared leather. The Zemstvo Union's order department supplied the Government in 1916 with 5,000,000 pairs of winter boots, 4,000,000 winter coats, 5,000,000 pairs of gloves, and 10,000,000 pairs of socks all for the sum of 75 million roubles. The automobile department had purchased 1261 automobiles, 261 motor cycles, and 60 motor boats. The special factory maintained by the sanitary-technical department had turned out articles to the value of one and a half million roubles. Up to January 1st, 1916, this department had expended seven million roubles on medicine and provided 78,000,000 pieces of linen. Rather an advanced kind of feudalism.

The union of towns was organized, and in the two years the central treasury handled through its offices the sum of 125,000,000 roubles. It maintained 1600 relief institutions at the front, and fed 15,000,000 people up to July, 1916. It maintained about three hundred hospitals.

The peasantry had a vast system of co-operative organizations maintained by the peasants and workers. The fact that there were 37,000 co-operative institutions of all kinds, which had 13,000,000 members, and a capital of 3000 million roubles, showed what had been the development of the co-operative movement in Russia. This organizing of supplies and industry had taken place of necessity in the absence of capitalism. There were over 8,000,000 peasants in European Russia, who only worked at agriculture during rush periods, the rest of the time they worked in the production of some sort of merchandise for sale, not for use in the family of the producer. There were over 4,000,000 peasants whose whole time was engaged in handicrafts and small machine industries not grouped in the modern factory system, and where there was the co-operative organization, they made better wages than the factory workers. Peasants turned out about 20,000,000 sets of cart wheels each year. Bastwire matting, shoes, baskets, wooden utensils and spoons, prepared tar and resin, carpets, lace, linen, table knives, artisans and pocket knives, locks, nails, pottery, brushes, toys, shoes and harness, agricultural implements and machines; tannery and fur dressing were some of the work followed up.

With the war the peasants broadened out more considerably, and provided most of the railway spikes and trench tools, over 1,000,000 horse shoes per year, and

wire cutters, parts of rifles, ambulances and waggons, millions of boots, sheepskin coats, knitted woollen gloves, socks and stockings. IN SUCH MANNER WAS INDUSTRY ORGANISED AMONG THE PEASANTS IN THE ABSENCE OF CAPITALISM.

Agricultural production also covered a greater scope than we know it in Australia. Enormous tonnage of tobacco, tea, sugar, flax, hemp, cotton, silk and wines were produced. In beet sugar alone there were 1,808,000 acres cultivated in 1914, and the yields and percentage of sugar almost up to the level per acre of Germany with her specialised scientific production. The most striking point about Russia's sugar industry is the size of the estates: In France an estate of 2500 acres is exceptionally large, but in Russia there are many estates of 70,000, and even up to 300,000 acres. It was predicted that Russia would soon be producing 5,000,000 tons of sugar per year, and be the leading producer.

Huge grain elevators, up to 2,500,000 poods (36lb.) capacity have been erected, and modern machinery, harvesters, binders, seed-drills, winnowers and threshers have now a large sale in Russia, many of the implement works are very large. The American Harvester Company has a factory near Moscow covering 62 acres, and 1000 men are employed in the gas and oil engine department alone. In the neighborhood of Berdiansk there are about 50 factories, the larger ones employing 5000 to 6000 men. In Western Siberia the annual turn over in harvesting machines is a very large one, and the International Harvester Co. has agents in nearly every village.

For those who imagine that Russia is still in the feudal stage a few figures of comparison with the leading capitalist nations, the United States will open their eyes. Take the textile industry: the figures for the United States were:

	No. of Factories.	Workmen Engaged.
Cotton	1328	403,422
Wool	979	203,128
Silk	902	114,900
Hemp, jute & flax	160	28,852

The Russian figures for 1912 were:—		
Cotton	850	550,762
Wool	1205	155,094
Silk	174	33,324
Flax, hemp & jute	245	100,949

In 1908 there were 174,061 coal miners in Russia, and over 2,000,000 workers in the various factories under inspection. In 1915 the production of steel in Russia was over 4,000,000 tons; Great Britain produced 8,000,000 tons.

The situation in the rural districts in regard to the accumulation of revolutionary knowledge was not much behind that of the cities. In keeping with the economic interpretation of history, that one society rears in its own womb the means for its own destruction, it was not strange that the Government unconsciously assisted in spreading this information. It was the custom of the Government, when it mobilised a new regiment of soldiers composed of men from the cities, to send them into some far off barracks in the wilds of Russia; and the peasants who were similarly mobilised were brought into the city garrisons. The soldiers, after arriving at the barracks, were usually invited to the homes of the peasants, who in their isolation were eager to get news of the outside world, and the revolutionists among them planted in the minds of their hosts the seeds of a new society in which they could see the solving of their agrarian difficulties.

When the serfs were liberated in 1864, with a view to preventing them from becoming "pauperised," they were given a little land on which to maintain themselves with the idea that they would cultivate for wages the estates of their masters. It was not made theirs individually, but was the property of the Mir, the village Commune, which was collectively responsible for the taxes.

With the rebellion of 1905 and the peasants demanding that the estates of the landed proprietors should have by rights been made over to the Mir, steps were taken by the autocracy to break up the Communes and increase peasant proprietorship as individuals. This led to the growth of the before mentioned co-

RELIEF COMMITTEE OF THE DEPENDENTS OF THE I.W.W. MEN.

The above committee has been formed for the purpose of maintaining the dependents of the imprisoned I.W.W. men, and is truly representative, embracing public spirited men and women from various organisations, men and women whose honesty of purpose has been well tested. It has been felt in forming such a committee that a feeling of confidence is bound to be created in the minds of the general public which is absolutely essential when contributions of money are asked for.

The formation of this committee is not merely due to the ideas of a few people getting together, but is in response to an urgent appeal from many quarters that this fund should be placed on a sure business basis, efficiently controlled and expeditiously directed. Members acting on it should not only be above all reproach as far as public opinion is concerned, but they must have the ability and energy to so manage its workings inside and out, that error cannot creep in. The women and children of the men in gaol must be provided for, must receive the money regularly, and know how much they will receive. No woman can successfully keep her home together, however small, unless she knows how much money will be in hand to pay the rent and the various tradesmen. The Relief Committee will undoubtedly solve this problem.

This committee has no connection with any other which may have been functioning in the past. The original committee for this work having ceased to operate last August the necessity has since arisen for the formation of a new committee. On account of the £150 received last October, from an authorised Queensland art union, being nearly exhausted, it has now become necessary to consider replenishing funds. The money is required for three wives and four children, two of the three women are so broken in health as to be physically incapable of engaging in any work to earn money.

In paying over money the public are advised to either make payment to a member of the committee or forward direct to the treasurer, John B. Steel. Postal notes are better than stamps in remitting.

As a committee it is taking no part in the agitation for the re-opening of the trial for the men in jail; the members individually are, naturally, in sympathy with a reopening of the cases. It is necessary, however, to clearly define just what the functions of this committee are, in order that the general public may clearly understand that all moneys contributed are for one purpose only—the support of the wives and children.

As moneys are contributed a monthly balance sheet will be issued through the columns of Sydney papers and others that will grant space for such publicity.

The committee has power to add to its numbers should additions be deemed advisable. The following is a complete list as it stands at present: President, Ex-Senator Rae; vice-presidents, Mrs. McNamara and Miss Sullivan; auditor, W. J. Miles, F.C.P.A.; treasurer, John B. Steel; secretary, Wyatt Jones; assistant secretary, Mrs. Lynch; minute secretary, George Washington; other committee members, Percy Brookfield M.L.A., Miss Swann, E. Judd, Arnold Holmes, J. Culhane, J. R. Sullivan, A. A. Rutherford, Mr. Hackett, H. C. Ulman, George Waite. WYATT JONES, Sec.

9 Agar St., Millers Point.

operative societies, some of which were industrial unions in embryo, that is, they were industrial artels which hired themselves out en bloc to perform a particular job for a private employer. They elected their own foremen, and the boss had to do all his dealings with their elected representative.

The London "Times," like the watchdog of capital it is, said of the Russian co-operative movement before the war:—"The growth of the co-operative movement is remarkable, perhaps too remarkable; it suggests a doubt whether such feverish growth is altogether healthy."

To be continued.

bate with me in October or November last regarding the accusations I made against him, and which are contained on pp. 12, 13 and 14 of "The Unity Question." I offered to prove those accusations. Whilst the negotiations regarding the proposed debate were in progress, he asked to adjourn the matter, as he had to go to Melbourne. His silence about the matter since then is significant.

Com. Everitt asserts that "the controlling faction" of the S.L.P. is not actuated by the principles of scientific socialism, but by the narrow dogmatism of party interest. In support of his assertion he quotes a sentence uttered by me in the unity debate, namely:

"I hope that unity of all Socialists who believe in S.L.P. principles will result from this debate."

I used the term "S.L.P. principles" as a short title for the principles adopted and advocated by the S.L.P., viz., the scientific principles of revolutionary socialism, and the recognition and endorsement of the principles embodied in the 1905 preamble of the I.W.W. (now W.I.L.L.U.). The Socialist Labor Parties of America, Great Britain and Australia, were the first political parties in the world to adopt and act on the whole of the aforementioned principles. The S.L.P. of Australia has continuously advocated the whole of these principles since April 1907, when I endorsed the 1905 preamble of the I.W.W., now W.I.L.L.U. The advocates of the whole of these principles, be Com. Everitt and the A.S.P. concerned, comparatively short time ago. Therefore I was justified in using the term "S.L.P. principles" as a short title for the whole of the principles mentioned. Com. Everitt attacked the S.L.P. on the ground that the A.S.P. principles were not the same as the S.L.P.'s. Is Com. Everitt opposed to the unity of all who believe in S.L.P. principles? If so, he aims to prevent unity on what he claimed were A.S.P. principles!

Com. Everitt says that the report of the Unity Debate, which was published, was a "biased report." Com. Reardon signed it as "a correct report." I thought, Com. Reardon, a typical copy of my speech before I commenced to speak. It may be as well to remind Com. Everitt that in preparing the report is not an answer to the unanswerable statement I made in the debate. However, until Com. Everitt states where the report is incorrect, I will leave readers to judge whether he or Com. Reardon is right.

If Com. Everitt is in favor of consulting "the rank and file," why did he and his Executive refuse to recommend their members to drop the names of both papers, and allow their members to vote on it?

I do not "distrust" the membership of the A.S.P., as Com. Everitt suggests. Many A.S.P. members are friends of mine. The actions of Coms. Everitt and Reardon compel me to distrust them. Com. Everitt seems to think that "Everitt and Reardon" means the same as "the membership."

Even now, if Com. McDonald says, the capitalists are organising for another blow at the workers. Hundreds of them "hunks of tons of coal are being stacked at Newcastle in readiness. Every day brings a new list of suppressed Socialist publications. Our disunity is rendering the work of labor folks more easy. Money that should be devoted to literature is going to stockpiling handbills. As Com. Blair says, "unity is essential."

Com. Nelson, who was one of the A.S.P. delegates at the preliminary meeting of the unity conference has since joined the S.L.P. Com. Thomas, another A.S.P. delegate at the Unity Conference, did not speak against the proposals of the S.L.P. Com. McDonald, the next A.S.P. delegate to the conference, says in the "I.S." January 5th, that he concurs with my statement in the Unity Debate that, "if it were not for the A.S.P. officials, unity would have been achieved long ago." If Comrades Everitt and Reardon don't accept my challenge, A.S.P. members should demand to know why.

Any person who prevents the unity of all who believe in scientific Socialist principles is acting against the best interests of the working class and humanity, and is assisting to perpetuate the awful conditions so ably portrayed by Marcia Reardon in "Capitalism v. Maternity." Only the actions of Comrades Everitt and Reardon prevented unity being achieved last May. Their misrepresentations and untrue statements tend to perpetuate disunity.

Comrades of the A.S.P., how much longer will you allow Coms. Everitt and Reardon to keep us apart?

E. E. JUDD.

Unity, A Retrospect and a Reply.

Facts not Fiction.

By this time there has been a great deal written around the subject of unity. As may be easily seen in the history of the Socialist Parties given by Com. Judd in the Unity Debate, the attempt to join their forces has been made more than once or twice, and each time the attempt has resulted in failure.

One is forced to ask the question, Why? "The fault of the A.S.P. officials," says Com. Judd in answer.

It may have been so, and yet readers of Com. Judd's Party History cannot fail to be struck with the fact that in each case the officials of the A.S.P. were entirely different, with regard to the S.L.P., the same names appear again and again.

Possibly this is significant: can all the A.S.P. officials be dishonest? In fact one is forced to wonder if it is dishonesty on the part of the A.S.P. officials, or a mixture of distrust and absence of the true comradely spirit on the part of the members of the S.L.P.

Unity is desirable; it is essential; but it must be unity in the true sense of the word; unity which when achieved, makes the members of the United Party remember nothing else but that their principles are solid and their goal is the freedom of the working class. Until this is accomplished unity is of no avail, and any attempt to bring it about futile.

However, the article of Com. Judd's, which appears in this issue of the paper, deals with certain aspects of unity negotiations, which require and allow of reply, and consequently we have attempted to do so.

There is an old saying, "a half truth is worse than a whole lie," this applies to Com. Judd's statements as to the S.L.P.'s proposal to drop both names. He fails to state all the facts.

Let us see under what conditions the proposals were made. En passant, it would be as well to draw attention to another portion of Com. Judd's article where he would have us believe that because the delegates in the first were to decide the name of party and paper, beside drawing up the set of principles we must do so, even though diversion from this path be an attempt to overcome a deadlock; as in the case of the A.S.P. proposal to leave the name to a vote of the membership.

To return to the vague statement about the S.L.P. proposal.

To understand it, it is necessary to state the whole facts with regard to negotiations.

They are as follows:—

The first meeting of the delegates concerned in the late attempt to achieve unity was merely informal, called to discuss arrangements for re-opening negotiations, and was held on Easter Monday, 1917.

One of the delegates asked, "Did we intend resuming unity negotiations where they ended in 1914?"

Had we done so, the name of paper and party would have been already settled, i.e., The United Socialist Party of Australia, and the International Socialist for the name of the paper.

It is again well to break off here, and draw attention to the fact that Com. Judd in the debate and also in his article mentions not a word concerning this.

In answer to this, Com. Everitt stated what would be the position if it was done, and that though he personally was willing to abide by the decision of the 1914 Conference, he doubted whether the terms would be acceptable to the S.L.P., and also that it was hardly wise to drop entirely both party names; both had been well battled for, and both had had a hard struggle for recognition, consequently a new party name would require all the old fight to gain prominence.

He would suggest that this delegation start afresh, and as a means of overcoming the difficulty of names, that the United Party be called the S.L.P., and the name of the official organ the "I.S.," or vice versa. This suggestion was readily adopted by Com. Clausen, who spoke for fully 10 minutes, on reasons why he con-

sidered the name 'People' should be dropped, stating that several attempts had been made within their own party to do so.

Com. Judd thought that the idea might be worth considering, but did not commit himself. Com. Moroney remained silent.

In the face of this, the statement that the "actions of Comrades Reardon and Everitt compel me to distrust them" (see Com. Judd's article) is rather sweeping. At the very outset a member and an official of the A.S.P. is ready to give up what would have been a decided advantage, were we merely out for names and not principles, and suggests a way to overcome at once any difficulty that might arise regarding them.

The next meeting, the one at which definite proposals were first considered, we will call No. 1, as it is desired that readers take marked notice of the NUMBER of meetings, and the business transacted at each, as it vitally affects certain statements made with regard to alleged promises, etc., and the wager laid by Com. Judd and accepted by Com. Everitt, and about which the former is also "strangely silent."

In between the first informal meetings and No. 1 Conference the A.S.P. Executive endorsed Com. Everitt's suggestion, on the strength of his and his co-delegates' report of its reception by the A.S.P. representatives.

The first proposal put forward at No. 1 Conference was that the name of the Party be S.L.P., the A.S.P. delegates voted for this proposal, thinking that they were carrying out portion of the above mentioned suggestion; they were soon disillusioned, when the question of the name of the paper arose. Com. Judd came straight forward with his proposal that the name be the "Rev. Soc." An amendment was moved by Com. Reardon that the name be the "I.S." Even Com. Clausen, who spoke for so long at the informal meeting in favour of the suggestion, backed down.

Was our frankness in striving to smooth the path to unity at an informal meeting interpreted by the S.L.P. a sign of weakness, and an opportunity for them to secure unity on their own terms?

It was finally decided that both names be submitted to the two Executives for their consideration, and that the next meeting was to take place on the ninth of May (Wednesday night).

At this next meeting (No. 2 and FINAL) Com. Judd reported that his executive had endorsed "Rev. Soc." Com. Reardon reported that our Executive had re-affirmed its first motion, and stated that the S.L.P. would be only showing a spirit of unity in accepting the name "I.S." seeing that we had voted without demur for the name S.L.P. Thus a deadlock arose, the delegates were in precisely the same position as at the end of No 1 meeting.

After some talk regarding the position

Com. Judd suggested that he come before our Executive and state his attitude regarding the name. The A.S.P. delegates agreed to the suggestion.

As a result of further talk on the matter Com. Judd asked Com. Reardon first, "In the event of your Executive endorsing the name 'Rev. Soc.' will you give it your endorsement when it goes to the membership?" He stated at the same time as his reason for asking the question that a proposition would be more likely to be carried when placed before the members by a unanimous vote of the Executive. Com. Reardon said that he would stand by the decision of his Executive. Com. Judd then asked Coms. MacDonald and Everitt separately, would they be prepared to stand by the Executive in the event of the latter endorsing the name "Rev. Soc."

They each answered in the affirmative.

As readers of the Unity Debate will remember, Com. Reardon stated that at that time the Executive was not complete; in fact, the three delegates were the majority, although proxy appoint-

ments were daily expected. In the face of this it was rather superfluous energy for Com. Judd to come and address them, and it may have been this fact that made Com. MacDonald remark, "We are the Executive."

Com. Everitt made the remark about using more tact; it was quite permissible for him to do so, seeing that by the following Saturday the Executive might be complete, also that it is not always advisable to talk about Executive business, a fact fully realised and acted upon by the S.L.P., and also that frankness on Com. Everitt's part ended when the S.L.P. abused our confidence in the first place.

This, then, is the origin of the famous promise about which Com. Judd has had so much to say.

In connection with it it should be clearly noticed a very significant fact. If such a promise was made, where was the necessity for Com. Judd to waste his valuable time in addressing us? The suggestion emanated from himself, and surely if such a promise had been given, he would never have thought of it. When asked this question at a later date, Com. Judd stated that there were four meetings, three officials and one informal, and that it was at the second official meeting that the alleged promise was made. It was then that Coms. Reardon and Everitt contradicted him, and he laid a wager with the latter that there were four meetings. Com. Reardon immediately referred to the minutes, and proved conclusively that there were only three, one informal, and two official. The following day Com. Judd still adhered to his idea, but admitted that he had not found time to look up the minutes, and has said nothing about the matter since.

On Saturday, May 12th, Com. Judd came before the Executive, and for two hours "lectured us on our awful past." At its conclusion the Executive was still in favour of its previous resolution; they thought the S.L.P. might have met them half way, and shown a more decided spirit of unity, and they were not inclined to alter their attitude, nevertheless seeing that unity was desirable, and that the two executives were at a deadlock, they tried another way out of the difficulty.

Com. Everitt proposed that as we were agreed on principle, let us unite at once and leave the name of the paper to be decided by a vote of the entire membership. He asked Com. Judd if he would agree to recommend this course to his Executive, and he replied "NO."

Now in his article Com. Judd states that "the 'I.S.' editor is strangely silent about the fact that I explained to his Executive on the 12th May how unity could be achieved before the end of the month, and that they would not accept my proposal."

Com. Judd is "strangely silent" as to how he suggested that desirable result could be achieved.

When Com. Judd, in reply to Com. Everitt's question, refused to recommend to his Executive that the two parties unite on principle and leave the name to a vote of the membership, he urged as a reason against it, that it would take too long; if you accept the name "Rev. Soc." now, we can unite at once.

Com. Everitt pointed out that in any case the ballot papers would have to go out for members of the new Executive to be elected, and that while the members were voting on this question, they could vote on the name of the paper at the same time. Com. Judd then said that he personally would put forward the suggestion that the new Executive be formed from the two present Executives, so that no time might be lost in applying to the rank and file. No remark is necessary, except that after making such an autocratic suggestion, his remark that, "Everitt seems to think that Everitt and Reardon means the same as the membership," is, to say the least of it, uncalled for.

Finally, it was decided that we adhere to our previous resolution, but suggest as an alternative that we unite on principle, and leave all else to a vote of the Executive.

Continued on page 1.

UNITY. A RETROSPECT AND A REPLY.

Facts Not Fiction.

Continued from Page 3.

ture membership. The reply they received in answer to this is fully quoted in the Unity Debate, and the following resolution forwarded:—

"That this Executive disagrees with the proposal of the A.S.P. and proposes that in the event of unity both the names 'People' and 'I.S.' be dropped and a new name submitted."

That, surely, is a clear proof that a spirit of unity was not prevalent amongst them. There is no doubt that they were cornered; what more democratic suggestion than for the membership to decide, and yet the S.L.P. put a name first, and insist that the 'I.S.' should not be voted upon, using great diplomacy in trying to throw the onus of the blame upon us.

When a party refuses to unite on principle, what more can be done? We could do nothing more than break off negotiations.

Next comes the Unity Debate, of which what Com. Everitt calls a "botched report," appeared in the papers. Com. Judd takes exception to this.

It may be as well to state now that neither here nor in any other article have we ever attempted to accuse Com. Judd or his organisation for being responsible for it, but whether it was botched or not the following will show:

When the debate was handed to Mrs. Reardon by Com. Judd he said then that the reporters had made such a muddle of the questions that he personally would suggest omitting them entirely from the report. She glanced at the report of Com. Reardon's speech, and saw at once that it was almost unrecognisable, and when it was read by Com. Reardon himself he also said that he would not acknowledge it as his case for the A.S.P.

The other members of the Executive were also anxious that the questions be published, and finally it was decided that Com. Reardon re-write his statement as best he could. Com. Judd, as he says, of course had his case already prepared and read it from manuscript.

The most biased individual will admit that we were at a disadvantage; it is by no means easy to re-write an impromptu speech word for word, and although Com. Reardon signed his report as correct, much was left out, and many telling points, although small in themselves, omitted. With regard to questions, Comrades Reardon and Judd spent about five hours endeavouring to patch them up. Com. Judd had forgotten many of them, and Com. Reardon was in difficulty owing to the fact that as most of the questions had been asked to Com. Judd, and reporters were present, he had not bothered about them.

When they were finally settled, it was found that the question asked by Com. Everitt concerning Com. Judd's refusal to recommend Unity on principle to his Executive, had been entirely altered.

After several arguments on the subject, Com. Judd had to appeal to members present at the debate; they confirmed Com. Everitt's statement, and the question was inserted as it now appears.

Now all these facts prove that the report WAS "botched"; but we repeat that we never have condemned anyone but the reporters; it was an unfortunate accident for us, and as such was regarded.

In Com. Judd's statement, as will be remembered, he made certain accusations against members of the A.S.P. who had applied for a charter from headquarters of the W.I.U. in America, and subsequently had been granted the Australian administration of that organisation.

Wishing to refute these accusations which were entirely unfounded, the W.I.U. G.E.B. sent a challenge to Comrade Judd to prove his words. They received a reply to the effect that the latter would be willing to debate Com. Everitt, and suggesting that the Domain be chosen for the meeting place. The

letter was received two days before the date suggested, and was obviously ridiculous; people who frequent the Domain realise what a floating crowd there is, beside the greater strain of open air speaking. This was pointed out by the G.E.B. in their reply, and they stated that as the statements were made in a certain hall, and Sydney Branch had offered the use of that said hall free, that the debate take place there, or as an alternative any other suitable hall. A date was suggested, and the G.E.B. stated that two delegates were appointed to meet delegates from the S.L.P. as early as possible, and that the G.E.B. was prepared to pay cost of hall and of circularising members of both organisations.

Before a reply was received from the S.L.P., Com. Judd was informed that Com. Everitt was obliged to go away and was asked that a fortnight later be fixed for the date. When the latter arrived back from Melbourne a letter was received from the S.L.P. simply stating that they had been informed by Com. Judd of his absence in Melbourne, and that they were of the opinion that it would be advisable to postpone the debate until after the Anti-Conscription Campaign. The W.I.U. delegates are still waiting for the S.L.P. to make an appointment with them. Comment is unnecessary, but once again the old saying is applicable; half a truth, etc.

With regard to Comrade Nelson resigning over unity, it is absolutely untrue, as Com. Nelson himself will state. He resigned over a misunderstanding, and since Com. Judd's article was received, has left the S.L.P. and re-joined the A.S.P. In any case, it is just as well to let sleeping dogs lie, when referring to resignations over unity. The Melbourne Branch S.L.P. went practically out of existence, leaving six members only; the rest joined the A.S.P. In Sydney Branch S.L.P. several members left over the same reason; also it may be as well to mention that a good deal of correspondence was suppressed. At least the A.S.P. cannot be accused of suppressing articles with regard to the late negotiations. The only one that has been held over was written by Com. McDonald, and has not yet been published, owing to correspondence going on between the two parties at the time.

Even Com. Judd does not hesitate to place his article in our hands for publication.

The substance of the late correspondence is as follows:—

"The A.S.P. C.E. carried a motion that 'we were at all times ready to unite on principle; and asking them if they were prepared to re-consider their attitude.

Their answer to this was merely a vague statement that they were prepared to open up unity negotiations where the A.S.P. broke them off. The latter, realising that while the S.L.P. still laid down conditions instead of uniting on principle it was useless to waste time, and that the reply was merely a quibble, carried the following motion in an endeavour to bind the S.L.P. down to a definite answer, i.e.—

"That the S.L.P. be asked the question: Are you prepared to unite on the principles of scientific Socialism, and leave all other matters of secondary importance to a vote of the members?" This was forwarded with a statement that "our Executive is desirous of a definite reply, as it is of the opinion that otherwise it will be useless to proceed with the matter." To this the S.L.P. replied with the following:—

The S.L.P. offered to resume unity negotiations at the stage where your organisation broke them off. In the opinion of my Executive, your reply is evasive. This Executive wishes to know if your Executive is prepared to resume negotiations, at the stage at which your Executive broke them off. If not—Why?

This and the article published by Com. Judd is what we get in answer to a straight out proposal to unite. Surely the most biased person must realise the difficulty of getting anything straight from the S.L.P. Diplomatic twisting is their forte, and they do it well. That would be bad enough, but in addition to this they seek to throw the blame where it is not due.

Com. Judd talks of secret games, and underlying motives, and throws the blame of disunity on the shoulders of Comrades Everitt and Reardon.

Members of the A.S.P., at least, will realise that if there is one member of their party who, if he studied his own interests, would be in favour of any conditions for unity, it would be Com. Everitt, so for all that he and Com. Reardon

A. S. P.

NEWS AND NOTES.

CENTRAL EXECUTIVE.

PARTY OFFICERS.

The annual ballot of Party officers is rendered unnecessary this year, by the fact that apart from the names of those holding office, no others were nominated.

The nominations were:—
General Secretary, A. S. Reardon.
Trustees (2), Mrs. Reardon and A. Hilder.
They are therefore declared elected unopposed.

In the matter of Treasurer; this office was held by Com. Wegner, now deceased, and two branches having included a motion in Conference Business, that the officers of Gen. Sec. and Treasurer be combined, the matter left over till conference.

CONFERENCE.

All papers in relation to the Easter Conference have been sent to all Branch Secretaries, and they are asked to get everything fixed up as early as possible. Also to notify headquarters if they are sending delegates, and arrangements will be made to accommodate them.

The attention of all Branches is called to the C.E. action in the matter of Com. Samsonoff, as reported on another page, and they are asked to also follow suit.

Next meeting of C. E., Saturday March 16th, business important.

A. S. REARDON.

Gen. Sec.

"THE INTERNATIONAL SOCIALIST."

Does the "I.S." suit you? Do you think it is doing good work. Do you wish to see the good work continue. If so, show your appreciation and assist by getting subscribers, also donations to our Press Fund. Funds MUST be had to carry on.

MATTER HELD OVER.

Owing to it being necessary to continue the articles on "The Russian Revolution" and "Socialism and War," and the space given to the question of unity, an article on the Paris Commune, the anniversary of which is March 17th, have been held over until next issue.

"Socialism and War" also crowded out

have got out of their exertions for the party has been hard work and slander from the S.L.P. In any case, now that the membership have read both accusations and replies to them, it will be for them to decide; if these comrades are as guilty as Com. Judd suggests, nothing can be too bad for them; they deserve to be driven out of the party; but it would be just as well for the members to make sure first, if either of the local branches wishes to hear them debate the fact of whether they made certain promises or not; they will both be willing to go before either or both. At the same time it would be an easier matter for Com. Judd to snatch a few moments to look up the minute book, and satisfy himself of his mistake, for he insists that these promises were made prior to the last meeting of delegates; yet this fact is absolutely true and certain. COMRADE MACDONALD ONLY ATTENDED ONE MEETING, AND THAT WAS THE FINAL ONE; and according to Com. Judd he was one of those who promised.

This, then, is an attempt to put a clear statement of facts before readers and members. We are of the opinion that it is principles, and not personalities, that count, and only unity on these terms can ever be final and lasting. We have made a fair, straightforward offer to the S.L.P., if they refuse it we are not to blame. We have repeatedly offered to UNITE ON PRINCIPLE, and that offer holds good now and always.

Marcia Reardon and Ray Everitt

(As there has been a good deal of correspondence on unity and great deal of space taken up, we have decided to close discussion on the subject. We have made a clear, straightforward offer; if the S.L.P. desire unity they will accept it; if not, all the talking in the world won't do any good.—Ed. "I.S.")

TO UNATTACHED SUPPORTERS

Whosoever you are, if you believe in Scientific Socialism, you must recognise the need for organisation. Why not set a good example to the workers whom you come in contact with, and whom we know you try to educate, by joining up with the A.S.P.

If there is no BRANCH in your locality, you can become a MEMBER AT LARGE, and thus become a REAL LIVE WIRE.

For further information, drop a line to the General Secretary, A.S.P., 115 Goulburn Street, Sydney.

BRANCH DIRECTORY.

Any branch desiring matter published under the above heading, should write clearly what is needed, and forward same to this office.

BROKEN HILL.

Socialist Hall, Sulphide St.

All rebels making their way to the "Hall" will receive a welcome at the above address.

CORRIMAL BRANCH.

B. Lewis, Main Street, Corrimal, Secretary.

IPSWICH BRANCH.

P. Stalker, Short's Boarding House, Brisbane Street, Ipswich, Secretary.

MELBOURNE BRANCH.

47 Victoria St., Melbourne.

Library and Reading Room for members. Lectures held every Sunday evening. Economic Class every Wednesday evening. Visitors welcomed.

MT. LARCOM.

Secretary, Chas. Jacobsen, Mt. Larcom, via Gladston.

NEWTOWN BRANCH.

Hall, Hatte's Arcade, King St., Newtown. Library for Members. Business meeting held alternate Thursday evening.

SYDNEY BRANCH.

Hall, 369 Pitt St., City. Library for members. Lecture every Sunday evening. Debating class held every Monday evening. Business meeting every alternate Thursday evening. Dance every Friday evening.

AUSTRALASIAN SOCIALIST PARTY LITERATURE DEPARTMENT.

Ancient Society—Lewis H. Morgan; cloth, 6/-; posted, 6/3.
Britain for the British—R. Blatchford; paper cover, 6d.; posted, 7d.
Capital—Karl Marx; 3 vols., 8/- each; posted, 8/6.
Charles Darwin and Karl Marx—E. Ave-ling; paper, 3d.; posted, 4d.
Economic Discontent—Father T. J. Hagerty; paper, 2d.; posted, 3d.
Economies of Socialism—H. M. Hyndman; cloth, 3/6; posted, 3/9.
Human Slaughter House—W. Lamazus; paper, 1/6; posted, 1/8.
Introduction to Socialism—N. A. Richardson; paper, 3d.; posted, 4d.
Love's Coming of Age—E. Carpenter; cloth, 1/6; posted, 1/8.
Landmarks of Scientific Socialism—Engels; cloth, 4/-.
Merrie England—R. Blatchford; paper, 6d.; posted, 7d.
Mutual Aid—P. Kropotkin; paper, 1/6; posted, 1/8.
New Socialism, The—R. R. La-Monte; paper, 6d.; posted, 7d.

IMPORTANT.

When ordering literature it is well to add the cost of registration (3d.). This is necessary to guarantee delivery.

Printed and Published by William Joseph Thomas, at 115 Goulburn Street, Sydney, for the Australian Socialist Party.

SOCIALIST HALL

369 Pitt Street.

EVERY FRIDAY EVENING, DANCE.

LECTURE EVERY SUNDAY EVENING